SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR.

Contempt Petition No. 55 /2005

PETITIONER : M.H.Wase s/o M.M.Wase, aged about 59 years, Lecturer, DIET, Pendra, District Bilaspur, C.G.

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS CONTEMNORS : 1.Alok Shukla, Secretary, School Education Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur, C.G.

2.G.S.Dhananjay, Director, Lok Shikshan Sanchalanalaya, Chhattisgarh, Raipur.

3.Yogesh Shukla, District Education Officer, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, C.G.

P.R. No. 1089/05 Presented by Shri Ramesh Tiwari dated 9-8-05

CONTEMPT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 215 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA READ WITH SECTION 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT.

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ABILSPUR ; CHHATTISHGARH

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI H.L.DATTU, C.J.

Contempt Petition No. 55 of 2005

PETITIONER: M.H. Wase

Vs.

RESPONDENTS: Alok Shukla & another.

Present : Shri A.K. Prasad, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri V.R. Tiwari, counsel for respondent No. 2.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 1st March, 2007)

This Court by its order dated 27.04.2004 had disposed of W.P. No. 1096 of 2004 and directed the petitioner to make appropriate representation to the respondents and further directed the respondents to consider and decide the representation in accordance with law as early as possible, preferably within two months from the date of receipt of the representation, by passing a reasoned order.

Alleging that the respondents have not considered the representation of the petitioner and have not passed reasoned order, the petitioner is before me in this petition filed under Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Court Act 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, inter alia, seeking the relief of initiating contempt proceedings against the respondents and punish them for willful and deliberate disobedience of the orders and directions issued by this Court.

The respondents are served and they have entered their appearance through learned counsel. The contesting respondent has filed counter affidavit before this court stating that the respondents have considered the representation of the petitioner and passed appropriate orders.

Since the respondents have complied with the orders and directions issued by this Court, the question of initiating contempt proceedings does not arise. Therefore, the petition is rejected. However, liberty is given to the petitioner to question the correctness or otherwise of the order passed by the respondents on the representation filed by the petitioner before the appropriate forum. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
Chief Justice